

## REMARKS

Claims 1-37 are pending. As indicated on page 2 of the Advisory Action, the Examiner alleged that the feature of the present invention identified by the language, "a security unit that executes . . . identification processing of data. . . said identification processing including utilizing an identifier corresponding to a connector through which a terminal is connected to encipher a received key code" reads on "the use of public key cryptography being used to encrypt data sent from the terminals via the terminal connectors," as disclosed by Crandall. The Examiner restated his assertion that, "in public key cryptography, the key itself is an identifier and corresponds to or verifies the identity of the sender or connector from which a message is sent." According to the Examiner, if deciphering is successful, it verifies the identity or source of the message (i.e., enciphered key code).

Applicants respectfully submit that in a public key cryptography system such as the one disclosed in Crandall, a private key is generated using a random number generator. The private key is then provided to a secure key generator and is used to generate an encryption key. Crandall does not provide any information that indicates that the private key is an identifier corresponding to a connector through which a terminal is connected. Rather, the private key in Crandall is simply a randomly generated number string and is not an identifier corresponding to a connector. See Crandall, column 2, lines 32-39.

In lines 12-13 of the last paragraph on the second page of the Advisory Action, the Examiner states that, "[i]f deciphering is successful, it verifies the identity or source of the message (i.e., enciphered key code). In public key cryptography, a receiver uses a key source to generate another private key and a secure key. The private key generated by the receiver is then used in a secure key generator along with the key generating information provided by the sender to generate a deciphering key. See Crandall, column 2, lines 47-51. Thus, in a public key cryptography system, the success of the deciphering depends on the generation of the deciphering key, which was produced as a result of the information provided by both the receiver and sender, and is not based on verification of identity or source of the message. In other words, the success of deciphering is not based on any identifier of a connector; rather, it is based on key generating information.

Assuming *arguendo* that the Examiner's assertion regarding a key in public key cryptography being an identifier is correct, the key is not an identifier corresponding to a connector. The key is simply a random number and does not correspond to a connector.

In the last paragraph of page 3 of the Advisory Action, the Examiner stated that Beasley

disclosed identification processing of data that has been received from any one terminal. The Examiner concludes by stating that in identifying the terminal which sent the message, one is also identifying the connector through which the message was sent. Applicants respectfully submit that FIG. 2B of Beasley illustrates a data packet including a sender address. Therefore, at most, Beasley identifies the sender of the data packet. No information is included in the data packet that indicates a connector is identified.

In light of the foregoing, independent claims 1, 7, 13, 17, 21, 25, 29, 33, and 37 are patentable over Beasley in view of Crandall, as neither Beasley nor Crandall, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the above-identified feature of the claims. As the dependent claims depend from the independent claims, the dependent claims are patentable over the references for at least the reasons presented above for the independent claims.

Ostermann, Wilder, and Onsen do not add any relevant information to the combination of Beasley and Crandall. Thus, the claims of the present invention are patentable over the various combinations of the references.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of the Response, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

12-28-05

By:

  
Reginald D. Lucas  
Registration No. 46,883

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501